

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00221 01 OF 11 151233Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05
SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00
INRE-00 /078 W

-----034564 151305Z /50

O R 151121Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2758
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS BELGIUM
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GERMANY

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 11 MBFR VIENNA 0221

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
SUBJ: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF
APRIL 12, 1978

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: IN THE APRIL 12 INFORMAL SESSION
OF THE VIENNA TALKS, THE ALLIES WERE REPRESENTED BY THE
BELGIAN, FRG AND US REPS, AND THE EAST BY SOVIET REPS TARASOV
AND SHUSTOV, CZECHOSLOVAK REP KEBLUSEK AND GDR REP OESER.
MILITARY ADVISORS WERE ALSO PRESENT.

2. IN THIS SESSION, WESTERN REPRESENTATIVES PRESENTED
THE NEW WESTERN INITIATIVE. EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES SAID
THEY WOULD NOT MAKE COMMENTS OR ASK QUESTIONS ABOUT THE
INITIATIVE IN THE PRESENT SESSION, BUT INDICATED THAT THEY
WOULD DO SO IN THE NEXT SESSION, SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 14.
EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES COMMENTED ON THE EASTERN POSITION ON
REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS AS REFLECTED IN THE EAST'S FEBRUARY

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00221 01 OF 11 151233Z

19, 1976 PROPOSAL. THEY SAID THAT THE PHASE I COMMITMENTS ON
PHASE 2 REDUCTIONS ENVISAGED UNDER THAT PROPOSAL FOR DIRECT
PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE US AND USSR DID NOT INCLUDE
SPECIFIC COMMITMENTS ON ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS. EASTERN REPRESENTA-
TIVES ALSO COMPLAINED THAT THE WEST IN ITS OWN FIGURES HAD
ALLOCATED MILITARY PERSONNEL PERFORMING THE SAME FUNCTIONS
BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR FORCES DIFFERENTLY FOR EAST AND WEST.

THEY ASKED TEN QUESTIONS ON RECENTLY TABLED WESTERN DATA. WESTERN REPS ASKED FURTHER QUESTIONS ON RECENTLY TABLED EASTERN DATA AND ANSWERED SOME OF THE EAST'S QUESTIONS ON WESTERN DATA.

3. CZECHOSLOVAK REP LED OFF. HE SAID WESTERN REPS, WHETHER DELIBERATELY OR NOT, WERE MISREPRESENTING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EAST'S FEBRUARY 1976 PROPOSAL AS IT CONCERNED REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS. THE FEBRUARY 1976 PROPOSAL CONTAINED TWO SIGNIFICANT CHANGES FROM THE EAST'S NOVEMBER 1973 PROPOSAL IN THIS REGARD: IN CONTRAST TO THE EAST'S INITIAL DRAFT AGREEMENT, THE EAST HAD AGREED THAT IN THE FIRST PHASE ONLY CERTAIN AGREED TYPES OF ARMAMENTS OF THE USSR AND THE USA SHOULD BE REDUCED, RATHER THAN ALL ARMAMENTS. SECOND, THE EAST HAD PROPOSED THAT THE QUESTION OF WHICH SPECIFIC ARMAMENTS SHOULD BE REDUCED BY THE REMAINING PARTICIPANTS AND THE MANNER IN WHICH THEY WOULD BE REDUCED SHOULD BE SOLVED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS IN THE SECOND PHASE.

4. CZECHOSLOVAK REP CONTINUED WITH CRITICISM OF THE WESTERN ALLOCATION BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR, STATING THAT THE WEST HAD PROCEEDED IN THE INEQUITABLE WAY THROUGH ALLOCATING GROUND-BASED AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL OF THE UK, FRG, BELGIUM AND THE NETHERLANDS TO THE AIR FORCES, WHILE COUNTING THE SAME TYPE OF PERSONNEL IN THE FORCES OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND POLAND AS GROUND FORCES. THE WEST HAD ALSO INCLUDED THE PERSONNEL OF
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00221 01 OF 11 151233Z

FRG PERSHING UNITS UNDER AIR FORCES AND HAD FAILED TO ALLOCATE HELICOPTER PERSONNEL PROPERLY. WESTERN REPRESENTATIVES HAD EARLIER ADMITTED THAT THESE POSITIONS WERE INACCURATE AND ERRONEOUS, BUT, DESPITE THESE ADMISSIONS, THEY HAD DONE NOTHING TO CHANGE THEM.

5. BELGIAN REP FOLLOWED WITH FURTHER QUESTIONS ON THE EAST'S NEWLY TABLED DATA. TARASOV ANSWERED WESTERN DATA QUESTIONS FROM THE APRIL 4TH SESSION, AND ASKED TEN QUESTIONS ABOUT THE NEWLY TABLED WESTERN DATA. US REP ANSWERED A NUMBER OF THESE QUESTIONS AND ASKED A FURTHER DATA QUESTION OF THE EAST.

6. FRG REP PRESENTED THE NEW WESTERN INITIATIVE. IN A BRIEF COMMENT, TARASOV SAID EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES WOULD THOROUGHLY STUDY THESE PROPOSALS AND REPORT THEM TO THEIR GOVERNMENTS. HE SAID IT WAS MOST LIKELY THAT EASTERN REPS WOULD HAVE CLARIFYING QUESTIONS ON THE WESTERN PROPOSALS, BUT THEY WOULD ASK THEM AT A LATER POINT.

7. THE NEXT SESSION WILL BE HELD APRIL 14. END SUMMARY.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00221 02 OF 11 151257Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05
SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00
INRE-00 /078 W

-----034726 151304Z /41

O R 151121Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2759
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS BELGIUM
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GERMANY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 11 MBFR VIENNA 0221

8. TARASOV AS HOST WELCOMED PARTICIPANTS. HE ASKED THE
CZECHOSLOVAK REP TO MAKE THE FIRST STATEMENT.

9. CZECHOSLOVAK REP SAID THAT, AT THE INFORMAL SESSION
OF APRIL 4, THE CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE, IN TRYING TO REACT
TO CZECHOSLOVAK REP'S OWN STATEMENT OF MARCH 7, HAD EXPRESSED
SEVERAL VIEWS WHICH HAD SURPRISED EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES
AND TO WHICH CZECHOSLOVAK REP WISHED TO REPLY IN THE PRESENT
SESSION. THE CANADIAN REP HAD ASKED WHAT WAS THE MEANING OF
CZECHOSLOVAK REP'S STATEMENT THAT THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES
WERE PREPARED TO CARRY OUT REDUCTIONS OF THEIR ARMAMENTS,
AS CZECHOSLOVAK REP HAD STATED, QUOTE ONLY IN THAT CASE, IF
ALSO ALL WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WOULD CARRY OUT THE
SAME REDUCTION ON THEIR PART. UNQUOTE. THE EASTERN
POSITION REGARDING THE REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS WAS WELL KNOWN
TO WESTERN REPRESENTATIVES, AND THE CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE'S
QUESTION SEEMED TO BE RATHER ARTIFICIAL. NEVERTHELESS, EASTERN
REPS WERE READY TO GIVE AN EXPLANATION.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00221 02 OF 11 151257Z

10. CZECHOSLOVAK REP SAID EASTERN PARTICIPANTS PROCEEDED FROM THE FACT THAT, ACCORDING TO THE UNDERSTANDING REACHED AT THE PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS, REDUCTIONS SHOULD EMBRACE NOT ONLY THE ARMED FORCES, BUT ALSO ARMAMENTS. THE EASTERN PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES WERE PREPARED TO CARRY ON SUCH A REDUCTION. IN THEIR DRAFT AGREEMENT, AS WELL AS IN THEIR PROPOSALS OF FEBRUARY 1976, THEY HAD INDICATED THE CONCRETE COMPOSITION AND SIZE OF SUCH A REDUCTION. EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES WOULD OF COURSE CONTINUE TO ADHERE TO THE VIEW THAT ANY REDUCTION MEASURES, INCLUDING THOSE IN THE FIELD OF ARMAMENTS, SHOULD BE OF A RECIPROCAL CHARACTER. THIS MEANT THAT EASTERN PARTICIPANTS WOULD REDUCE THEIR ARMAMENTS ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS ALSO CARRIED OUT REDUCTIONS OF THEIR OWN ARMAMENTS. A UNILATERAL REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS IN THE FORCES ONLY OF THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS, OR, SAY, OF ONE OF THEM WAS IMPOSSIBLE. WESTERN REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD NOT CHERISH ANY ILLUSIONS IN THIS RESPECT.

11. CZECHOSLOVAK REP SAID THAT THIS WAS THE ACTUAL MEANING OF THE VIEWS HE HAD EXPRESSED TO WHICH THE CANADIAN REP HAD REFERRED. REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EASTERN PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES DID NOT AGREE WITH THE IDEA THAT THERE EXISTED CERTAIN SPECIAL REASONS PERMITTING THE WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES AND CANADA, IN VIOLATION OF THE PRINCIPLE OF MUTUALITY, TO ESCAPE FROM REDUCING THEIR ARMAMENTS. EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES KNEW OF NO SUCH REASONS AND IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE TO UNDERSTAND HOW COUNTRIES WHICH WERE PARTICIPATING IN THE NEGOTIATION OF REDUCTIONS OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS COULD DECLARE, AS DID THE CANADIAN REP, THAT THEY DID NOT INTEND TO REDUCE THEIR ARMAMENTS AT ALL. SUCH AN APPROACH MUST NECESSARILY BE REGARDED AS ONE WHICH GREATLY IMPEDED THE NEGOTIATIONS.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00221 02 OF 11 151257Z

12. CZECHOSLOVAK REP SAID THAT, IN PUTTING FORWARD THE EASTERN PROPOSAL OF FEBRUARY 1976, EASTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD PROCEEDED FROM THE FACT THAT, TOGETHER WITH REDUCTIONS OF ARMED FORCES, IT WAS NECESSARY TO CARRY OUT REDUCTIONS OF ARMAMENTS, BOTH IN THE FIRST AND SECOND STATES OF REDUCTION. THE WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES AND CANADA -- THIS WAS AN IMPORTANT CONCESSION THE EAST HAD MADE TO THE WEST -- WOULD NOT CARRY OUT THESE REDUCTIONS IN THE FIRST STAGE OF REDUCTIONS, BUT THEY WOULD START AND TERMINATE THEM ONLY IN THE SECOND STAGE. FURTHERMORE, IN A FIRST STAGE AGREEMENT, THEY WOULD COMMIT THEMSELVES ONLY TO GENERAL OBLIGATIONS REGARDING THE SIZE AND TIMING OF THE REDUCTION OF THEIR ARMED FORCES. CONCRETE OBLIGATIONS, INCLUDING THOSE REGARDING THE COMPOSITION AND QUANTITY OF ARMAMENTS TO BE REDUCED, WOULD BE WORKED OUT IN THE COURSE OF SUBSEQUENT

NEGOTIATIONS.

13. CZECHOSLOVAK REP SAID THAT EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES
COULD NOT BUT BE SURPRISED BY THE RATHER STRANGE INTERPRETATION
OF CZECHOSLOVAK REP'S STATEMENT WHICH HAD BEEN GIVEN BY THE
CANADIAN REP. ACCORDING TO THE LATTER, CZECHOSLOVAK REP HAD
SHOW, AS CANADIAN REP HAD PUT IT, THAT THE ONLY NEW ELEMENT AS
REGARDS THESE REDUCTIONS IN THE EAST'S 1976 PROPOSALS AS
COMPARED WITH THE NOVEMBER 1973 PROPOSALS WAS THAT THERE WAS
SOME INCREASE IN THE ARMAMENTS WHICH COULD BE REDUCED IN THE
FIRST STAGE. BUT THE CZECHOSLOVAK REP HAD SAID NOTHING LIKE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00221 03 OF 11 151310Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05
SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00
INRE-00 /078 W

-----035009 151313Z /41

O R 151121Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2760
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS BELGIUM
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GERMANY

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 11 MBFR VIENNA 0221

THAT IN HIS REMARKS. INSTEAD, HE HAD UNDERLINED THAT, IN
THEIR PROPOSALS OF FEBRUARY 19, 1976, THE WARSAW TREATY
STATES HAD TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT THE REQUIREMENT OF THE WESTERN
STATES THAT THE REDUCTIONS BE CARRIED OUT QUOTE IN TWO
CONSECUTIVE STAGES UNQUOTE AND THAT THEY HAD INTRODUCED
QUOTE SUBSTANTIAL CONCESSIONS TO THE EAST'S INITIAL PROPOSAL
FOR A REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS TO BE CARRIED OUT BY THE USSR
AND THE USA IN THE FIRST STAGE, ESPECIALLY AS REGARDS NUCLEAR
WEAPONS. UNQUOTE.

14. CZECHOSLOVAK REP SAID THAT THE CANADIAN REP'S STATEMENT
SHOWED THAT WESTERN REPRESENTATIVES EITHER HAD NOT UNTIL NOW

UNDERSTOOD EASTERN PROPOSALS OR DID NOT WANT TO UNDERSTAND THEM. THESE PROPOSALS, AS EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES HAD REPEATEDLY EXPLAINED, INTRODUCED VERY SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES-- NOT ONLY QUANTTIVE ONES, BUT ALSO QUALITATIVE ONES -- INTO THE EASTERN POSITION. AS REGARDS THE REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS, THESE CHANGES CONTAINED IN PARTICULAR TWO

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00221 03 OF 11 151310Z

VERY SIGNIFICANT ASPECTS: FIRST, IN DISTINCTION TO THE EAST'S INITIAL DRAFT AGREEMENT, EASTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD AGREED THAT, IN THE FIRST STAGE, THERE SHOULD BE REUCED, NOT ALL ARMAMENTS OF THE USSR AND USA BUT ONLY CERTAIN AGREED TYPES OF ARMAMENTS. SECOND, EASTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD PROPOSED THAT THE QUESTION OF WHICH ARMAMENTS SPECIFICALLY AND IN WHICH MANNER THEY WOULD BE REDUCED BY THE OTHER DIRECT PARTICIPATING STATES SHOULD BE SOLVED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS IN THE SECOND STAGE. TO SHUT ONE'S EYES TO THESE IMPORTANT ELEMENTS IN THE PROPOSALS OF THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS MEANT TO DELIBERATELY BELITTLE THEIR SIGNIFICANCE. BUT THIS WAS AN UNOBJECTIVE AND UNCONSTRUCTIVE METHOD OF CONDUCTING NEGOTIATIONS.

15. CZECHOSLOVAK REP SAID THAT, AFTER THE EXCHANGE BY THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OF ADDITIONAL NUMERICAL DATA ON THE MANPOWER OF GROUND AND AIR FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE, IT HAD BECOME CLEAR TO EASTERN PARTICIPANTS THAT THE WEST CONTINUED TO ADOPT AN UNFOUNDED, ONE-SIDED POSITION ON THE QEUSTION OF THE ALLOCATION BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL ARMED SERVICES OF THE MANPOWER OF THE AIR DEFENSE FORCES, OF UNITS EQUIPPED WITH SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILES AND OF HELICOPTER UNITS. IT WAS IMPORTANT THAT FORCES OF THE SAME TYPE SHOULD BE COUNTED IN THE SAME MANNER. THIS MEANT THAT THE AIR DEFENSE FORCES' UNITS EQUIPPED WITH SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILES, AND HELICOPTER UNITS SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO ONE AND THE SAME ARMED SERVICE IN THE NATO COUNTRIES AS WELL AS IN THE WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES.

16. CZECHOSLOVAK REP CONTINUED THAT WESTERN REPRESENTATIVES, AS WAS KNOW, HAD INCLUDED UNDER AIR FORCE MANPOWER THEPERSONNEL OF THE AREA AIR DEFENSE FORCES OF THE UK, FRG, BELGIUM AND THE NETHERLANDS, AS WELL AS THE PERSONNEL OF THE PERSHING SQUADRONS OF THE FRG.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00221 03 OF 11 151310Z

17. CZECHOSLOVAKIAN REP CONTINUED, THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THESE FORCES WAS VERY LARGE. IF ONE, FOR EXAMPLE, TOOK

MISSILE UNITS OF THE FRG EQUIPPED WITH PERSHING LAUNCHERS, THEIR MANPOWER ALONE RAN TO THOUSANDS OF SOLDIERS AND OFFICERS, AND IN THEIR ARMAMENTS, ONE FOUND PRACTICALLY ALMOST HALF OF ALL PERSHING MISSILES IN CENTRAL EUROPE. IT SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT THAT, AS LONG AS THE WEST REFUSED TO CARRY OUT REDUCTIONS OF AIR FORCES ACCORDING TO ITS OWN SCHEME, ALL THESE UNITS WOULD BE EXCLUDED FROM REDUCTIONS. HOWEVER, THE WEST HAD AT THE SAME TIME INCLUDED THE PERSONNEL FO THE GROUND BASED COMPONENTS OF SIMILAR AIR DEFENSE UNITS OF POLAND AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA UNDER GROUND FORCE MAN POWER. SUCH A DIFFERENT ALLOCATION COULD, TO A CERTAIN DEGREE, EXPLAIN THE SO-CALLED DISCREPANCY IN THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF GROUND FORCES OF THE TWO GROUPINGS IN THE REDUCTION AREA AS WELL AS THE ARTIFICIAL CHARACTER OF THIS WESTERN CONCEPTION.

18. THE UNFOUNDED CHARACTER OF THE ALLOCATION OF THE THREE CITED CATEGORIES OF THE PERSONNEL BETWEEN THE ARMED SERVICES, AS EXPLAINED ABOVE, HAD AT LEAST PARTICALLY BEEN ADMITTED BY WESTERN PARTICIPANTS. IN THE INFORMAL SESSION OF OCTOBER 14, 1975, THE FRG REP HAD EXPRESSED HIMSELF IN FAVOR OF QUOTE FINDING MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE WAYS FOR REMOV-
ING DIFFICULTIES THAT HAVE ARISEN IN CONNECTION WITH THE THREE CONCRETE CASES MENTIONED BY THE EASTERN EUROPEAN

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00221 04 OF 11 151343Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00
NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13
L-03 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02 SS-15
TRSE-00 /078 W

-----035448 151347Z /41

O R 151121Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2761
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS BELGIUM
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GERMANY

S E C R E T SECTION 4 OF 11 MBFR VIENNA 0221

COUNTRIES, IN PARTICULAR AS REGARDS THE FORCES OF AIR DEFENSE OF THE COUNTRIES, HELICOPTER UNITS, AS WELL AS UNITS EQUIPPED WITH SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILES. UNQUOTE. WESTERN REPS HAD DECLARED THAT THEY WERE QUOTE PREPARED TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE FIGURES PUT FORWARD BY THEM AND TO EXEMPT SUBSTANTIAL NUMBER OF SERVICEMEN FROM THE OVERALL GROUND FORCE MAN POWER OF THE WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES UNQUOTE. IN THE INFORMAL SESSIONS OF THE 5TH AND 12TH OF NOVEMBER 1974, THE UK AND FRG REPS HAD SPOKEN ABOUT SUCH CORRECTIONS IN THE WESTERN ESTIMATES OF THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF WARSAW TREATY FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE WHICH SOULD QUOTE CONSIDERABLY DECREASE THEIR OVERALL STRENGTH UNQUOTE. BUT AT THE PRESENT STAGE, IN THE LIGHT OF CONTINUED CONSIDERATION OF THE DATA MATERIAL, EASTERN REPS WERE BEGINNING TO FEEL THAT WESTERN REPS, IN PRACTICE, WERE CONTINUING TO MAKE THE ALLOCATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL BETWEEN ARMED SERVICES DEPENDENT ON THE CONCEPTION OF DISPARITIES AND HAD MADE NO CORRECTIONS IN THEIR COUNTING. IF THIS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00221 04 OF 11 151343Z

WERE REALLY SO, THE SEARCH FOR REACHING UNDERSTANDING IN THE DATA DISCUSSION WOULD APPEAR VERY INEFFECTIVE, IF ONLY FOR THIS REASON.

19. DRAWING ON TALKING POINTS APPROVED BY THE AD HOC GROUP, BELGIAN REP SAID THAT AS THE WEST'S FIRST INTERVENTION IN THIS SESSION, HE WOULD LIKE TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS AS TO HOW THE EAST HAD ALLOCATED PERSONNEL IN THE FIGURES IT HAD PRESENTED. FIRST, AS REGARDS THE WAY IN WHICH THE EAST HAD ALLOCATED PERSONNEL BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR FORCES, IT WAS THE WEST'S UNDERSTANDING FROM WHAT EASTERN REPS HAD SAID PREVIOUSLY THAT ALL OF THE PERSONNEL OF THE NATIONAL AIR DEFENSE COMMANDS OF POLAND AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE EAST'S FIGURES FOR AIR MANPOWER OF THOSE TWO COUNTRIES. WESTERN REPS WOULD LIKE EASTERN REPS TO CONFIRM THIS. SIMILARLY, IT WAS ALSO THE WEST'S UNDERSTANDING FROM WHAT AMBASSADOR TARASOV HAD SAID ON JUNE 28, 1977 THAT, IN THE CASE OF EACH EASTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANT, THE EAST'S FIGURES FOR AIR MANPOWER INCLUDED PERSONNEL OF HELICOPTER UNITS WHICH SUPPORTED AIR FORCES. WOULD EASTERN REPS ALSO CONFIRM THIS?

20. BELGIAN REP STATED THAT, TURNING TO QUESTIONS ON HOW THE EAST HAD ALLOCATED GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL BETWEEN THE TWO CATEGORIES OF MAJOR FORMATIONS AND OTHERS, WESTERN REPS NOTED THAT AT THE LAST MEETING ON APRIL 4, AMBASSADOR TARASOV HAD SAID THAT BY THE TERM QUOTE SUBUNIT UNQUOTE THE EAST MEANT SUBUNTS OF THE PLATOON, COMPANY, BATTALION OR ARTILLERY BATTALION TYPE OR THEIR EQUIVALENT. AMBASSADOR

TARASOV HAD SAID ON MARCH 16 THAT OF THE PERSONNEL OF THE SOVIET GROUPS OF FORCES STATIONED IN POLAND AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA, QUOTE ONLY THE PERSONNEL OF SUBUNITS OF CENTRAL SUBORDINATION HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY UNQUOTE. IT WAS SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00221 04 OF 11 151343Z

THE WEST'S UNDERSTANDING, THEREFORE, THAT THE ONLY GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL OF THE SOVIET GROUPS OF FORCES IN THOSE TWO COUNTRIES WHOM THE EAST HAD COUNTED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY WERE PERSONNEL IN SUBUNITS OF BATTALION SIZE OR SMALLER. WAS THIS CORRECT?

21. BELGIAN REP SAID THAT AT THE LAST MEETING AMBASSADOR TARASOV HAD SAID PERSONNEL OF QUOTE SMALL UNITS AND SUBUNITS UNQUOTE DIRECTLY SUBORDINATE TO THE COMMAND OF THE GROUP OF SOVIET FORCES IN THE GDR HAD BEEN INCLUDED BY THE EAST IN THE SECOND CATEGORY. SINCE EASTERN REPS HAD SAID THAT QUOTE SUBUNIT UNQUOTE REFERRED TO UNITS OF BATTALION SIZE OR SMALLER, AND THAT ALL QUOTE DIVISIONS AND EQUIVALENT UNITS UNQUOTE HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN MAJOR FORMATIONS, WESTERN REPS ASSUMED THE TERM QUOTE SMALL UNITS UNQUOTE MEANT UNITS OF BRIGADE OR REGIMENT SIZE. WAS THIS CORRECT? IN THE ALLOCATION OF SOVIET GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL BETWEEN THE TWO CATEGORIES, WAS THE SOVIET ARTILLERY DIVISION IN THE GDR THE ONLY EXCEPTION TO THE PRINCIPLE OF SUBORDINATION? THAT IS, WAS THAT ARTILLERY DIVISION THE ONLY SOVIET UNIT, SUBUNIT, OR FORMATION WHICH WAS NOT SUBORDINATE TO A SOVIET ARMY IN THE GDR OR TO THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE GROUP OF SOVIET FORCES IN EITHER POLAND OR CZECHOSLOVAKIA BUT WHOSE PERSONNEL THE EAST HAD COUNTED IN THE FIGURE FOR MAJOR FORMATIONS?

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00221 05 OF 11 151406Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05
SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00
INRE-00 /078 W

-----035702 151408Z /50

O R 151121Z APR 78

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2762
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS BELGIUM
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GERMANY

S E C R E T SECTION 5 OF 11 MBFR VIENNA 0221

22. BELGIAN REP ASKED IF EASTERN REPS COULD TELL
THE WEST IN WHICH CATEGORY THEY HAD COUNTED THE SOVIET
BRIGADE IN BERLIN?

23. BELGIAN REP STATED THAT, ON A DIFFERENT SUBJECT,
WERE THE QUOTE PART-TIME PERSONNEL OF THE POLISH UNITS OF
TERRITORIAL DEFENSE UNQUOTE (JEDNOSTKI OBRONY TERYTORIALNEJ)
ONLY GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL OR WERE THERE ALSO AIR PERSONNEL
WHO FELL INTO THIS GROUP OF PERSONNEL WHOM THE EAST HAD
EXCLUDED FROM ITS FIGURES?

24. TARASOV SAID EASTERN REPS WOULD LIKE TO REPLY TO
THE THREE QUESTIONS WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY PUT TO EASTERN
REPS BY WESTERN REPS. THE FIRST OF THESE QUESTIONS HAD
BEEN RAISED BY THE US REP WHO HAD PUT THE FOLLOWING
QUESTION: QUOTE ON MARCH 16, IN ANSWERING A WESTERN QUES-
TION REGARDING WHETHER THERE WERE ANY DIVISIONS WHOSE PER-
SONNEL HAD NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE EASTERN FIGURES FOR
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00221 05 OF 11 151406Z

PERSONNEL OF MAJOR FORMATIONS, AMBASSADOR TARASOV HAD SAID
THAT THE PERSONNEL OF ALL WARSAW TREATY DIVISIONS AND QUOTE
EQUIVALENT FORMATIONS UNQUOTE HAD BEEN INCLUDED BY THE EAST
IN THE CATEGORY OF MAJOR FORMATIONS. WESTERN REPS WOULD
LIKE EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES TO EXPLAIN WHAT WAS MEANT BY
THE TERM QUOTE EQUIVALENT FORMATIONS UNQUOTE. HAD THE
PERSONNEL OF ANY SUCH UNITS BEEN INCLUDED IN THE CATEGORY
OF MAJOR FORMATIONS: IF SO, WHAT KIND OF UNITS HAD BEEN
INCLUDED? (APRIL 4, 1978 INFORMAL) UNQUOTE.

25. TARASOV SAID THE REPLY TO THIS QUESTION WAS, IN
ANSWERING THE QUESTION PUT FORWARD BY WESTERN REPS, EASTERN
REPS HAD INDICATED ON MARCH 16 THAT THE PERSONNEL OF ALL
DIVISIONS AND EQUIVALENT FORMATIONS HAD BEEN INCLUDED UNDER
MAJOR FORMATIONS IN THE FIGURES FOR THE GROUND FORCES OF
WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES. BY EQUIVALENT FORMATIONS, EASTERN
REPS MEANT BRIGADES WHICH, ALTHOUGH BEING SUBORDINATE
DIRECTLY TO THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE GROUP OF SOVIET FORCES
IN THE GDR HAD, HOWEVER, BEEN INCLUDED BY THE EAST IN THE

CATEGORY OF MAJOR FORMATIONS.

26. TARASOV SAID THAT THE SECOND QUESTION, WHICH HAD ALSO BEEN RAISED BY THE US REP ON APRIL 4, WAS AS FOLLOWS:
QUOTE DID THE FIGURES FOR PERSONNEL IN MAJOR FORMATIONS OF POLAND, CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND THE GDR INCLUDE PERSONNEL OF ANY UNITS, SUBUNITS AND FORMATIONS DIRECTLY SUBORDINATE TO MINISTRIES OF DEFENSE OR TO SOME OTHER HEADQUARTERS OR COMMAND HIGHER THAN MILITARY DISTRICT HEADQUARTERS? UNQUOTE.

27. TARASOV SAID THE REPLY TO THIS QUESTION WAS THAT PERSONNEL OF UNITS AND SUBUNITS ASSIGNED TO THE ARMED FORCES AND DIRECTLY SUBORDINATE TO THE MINISTRIES OF DEFENSE OF THE GDR, POLAND AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA OR TO HEAD-
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00221 05 OF 11 151406Z

QUARTERS HIGHER THAN MILITARY DISTRICT HEADQUARTERS, HAD BEEN INCLUDED BY EASTERN PARTICIPANTS IN THE SECOND CATEGORY, THAT IS, THE OVERALL STRENGTH OF FORCES NOT IN MAJOR FORMATIONS. AS TO PERSONNEL OF DIVISIONS, THEY HAD BEEN INCLUDED, AS EASTERN REPS ALREADY INDICATED ON MARCH 3, IN THE STRENGTH OF FORCES IN MAJOR FORMATIONS REGARDLESS OF THEIR SUBORDINATION.

28. TARASOV SAID THE THIRD QUESTION PUT BY THE US REP WAS: COULD EASTERN REPS TELL WESTERN REPS WHAT WERE THE PART-TIME SOLDIERS OF THE UNITS OF POLISH TERRITORIAL DEFENSE. WHAT DID THIS TERM MEAN IN THE CONTEXT OF THE EASTERN REPLY IN THE APRIL 4 SESSION? (COMMENT: EASTERN

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00221 06 OF 11 151422Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05
SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00
INRE-00 /078 W

-----035976 151427Z /50

O R 151121Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2763
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS BELGIUM
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GERMANY

S E C R E T SECTION 6 OF 11 MBFR VIENNA 0221

REPS SEEMED TO HAVE MISSED THE POINT OF THE QUESTION WHICH REQUESTED THE EAST TO DEFINE THE TERM QUOTE PART-TIME UNQUOTE.

29. TARASOV SAID THAT, BY THE WAY, VERY COMPREHENSIVE CLARIFICATION ON THE POLISH TERRITORIAL UNITS HAD BEEN GIVEN BY EASTERN REPS ON MARCH 8 AND 15, 1977. HOWEVER, THE REPLY WAS THAT PART-TIME PERSONNEL OF THE POLISH TERRITORIAL DEFENSE BELONGED TO CONSCRIPT PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO CONSTRUCTION, ROAD AND RAILWAY UNITS. THIS PERSONNEL WAS CALLED UPON TO SERVE PERIODICALLY IN THE UNITS OF TERRITORIAL DEFENSE. THE SIZE OF THESE UNITS WAS NOT ALWAYS IDENTICAL AND DEPENDED IN EACH PARTICULAR CASE ON REQUIREMENTS. IT WAS FOR THESE REASONS THAT, BOTH PREVIOUSLY AND IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PRESENT DATA EXCHANGE, EASTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD NOT INCLUDED PART-TIME PERSONNEL OF THE UNITS OF THE POLISH TERRITORIAL DEFENSE -- IN DISTINCTION TO THE PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL OF THESE UNITS -- IN COUNTING THE MILITARY MANPOWER OF THE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00221 06 OF 11 151422Z

WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES.

30. TARASOV SAID THESE WERE THE EAST'S REPLIES TO THE QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE WESTERN REPS. EASTERN REPS WOULD NOW LIKE TO PRESENT SOME QUESTIONS TO WESTERN REPS.

31. TARASOV SAID HIS FIRST QUESTION WAS, FROM ANSWERS TO EASTERN QUESTIONS GIVEN BY THE US REP ON APRIL 3, EASTERN REPS HAD DRAWN THE CONCLUSION THAT THE WEST HAD INCLUDED IN ITS FIGURES FOR MAJOR FORMATIONS OF THE GROUND FORCES ONLY THE PERSONNEL OF FORMATIONS AND UNITS ASSIGNED TO ARMY CORPS AND THAT ALL THE OTHER FORMATIONS AND UNITS, REGARDLESS OF THEIR SIZE OR SUBORDINATION, HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY, THAT IS, FORCES NOT IN MAJOR FORMATION. WAS THIS CONCLUSION CORRECT?

32. TARASOV SAID HIS SECOND QUESTION WAS THAT, IN THEIR INITIAL ANNOUNCEMENT OF DATA ON NATO GROUND FORCES MANPOWER IN 1973, WESTERN REPS HAD INDICATED THAT THE STRENGTH

OF US GROUND FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA WAS 193,000 MEN. IN TABLING THEIR OFFICIAL DATA IN DECEMBER 1976, WESTERN REPS HAD SAID THAT, OWING TO MORE PRECISE COMPILATION, THE STRENGTH OF NATO FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE HAD SHOWN AN INCREASE OF 14,000 MEN. THESE STATEMENTS HAD LED EASTERN REPS TO THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE FIGURE FOR US GROUND FORCES MANPOWER TABLED IN 1973 HAD ALSO INCREASED. HOWEVER, ACCORDING TO THE DATA SUBMITTED ON MARCH 15, 1978, THE TOTAL NUMBER OF US GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL HAD PROVEN TO BE EVEN LESS THAN THE INITIAL NUMBER. EASTERN REPS WISHED TO ASK WHETHER THIS WAS CORRECT? OR WAS IT CORRECT TO ASSUME THAT THE 14,000 MAN INCREASE IN NATO GROUND FORCE MANPOWER WAS OWING TO MORE PRECISE COMPILATION OF THE GROUND FORCE MAN-

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00221 06 OF 11 151422Z

POWER ONLY OF THE WESTERN EUROPEAN STATES AND CANADA? OR PERHAPS A NUMBER OF FUNCTIONS WHICH HAD EARLIER BEEN PERFORMED BY US MILITARY PERSONNEL HAD BEEN TURNED OVER TO CIVILIAN PERSONNEL?

33. TARASOV SAID HIS THIRD QUESTION WAS, AS WAS KNOWN, THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE IN CENTRAL EUROPE WAS REPRESENTED BY A SINGLE TACTICAL AIR FORCE WHICH, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE WESTERN CRITERION OF AIR FORCE ALLOCATION, HAD BEEN INCLUDED UNDER THE CATEGORY OF MAJOR FORMATIONS. IN THIS CONNECTION, EASTERN REPS WANTED TO ASK, WHAT US AIR FORCE PERSONNEL HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY?

34. TARASOV SAID HIS FOURTH QUESTION WAS, COULD WESTERN REPS DESCRIBE THE GENERAL TYPES OF HEADQUARTERS WHICH THE WEST HAD INCLUDED UNDER THE CATEGORY OF MULTILATERAL HEADQUARTERS OF NATO GROUND AND AIR FORCES?

35. TARASOV SAID THE FIFTH QUESTION WAS, HAD THE PERSONNEL OF FORMATIONS AND UNITS OF THE UNITED STATES GROUND FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA WHICH WERE NOT SUBORDINATED TO THE US GROUND FORCES COMMAND IN CENTRAL EUROPE BEEN COUNTED? IF SO, IN WHICH CATEGORY HAD THEY BEEN INCLUDED? EASTERN REPS ALSO WISHED WESTERN REPS TO SPECIFY IN WHICH CATEGORY THE PERSONNEL OF DUAL BASED UNITS PERMANENTLY STATIONED IN THE REDUCTION AREA HAD BEEN INCLUDED, AS WELL AS THE PERSONNEL OF THE PERSHING MISSILE ARTILLERY BRIGADE.

36. TARASOV SAID QUESTION NUMBER SIX WAS THAT, ON

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00221 07 OF 11 151433Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05
SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00
INRE-00 /078 W
-----036162 151505Z /50

O R 151121Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2764
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 7 OF 11 MBFR VIENNA 0221

FEB 15, 1977, WESTERN REPS HAD SAID THAT SERVICEMEN ASSIGNED TO AIR DEFENSE UNITS AND SUBUNITS OF THE FRG, BELGIUM, NETHERLANDS AND THE UK HAD BEEN DIVIDED BY THE WEST INTO TWO PARTS AND HAD BEEN INCLUDED BY WESTERN PARTICIPANTS IN THE RESPECTIVE ARMED SERVICES ON THE BASIS OF THE CRITERION OF MILITARY UNIFORM. IN THIS CONNECTION, EASTERN REPS WISHED TO CLARIFY, WHAT WERE THE FORMATIONS AND UNITS OF THE ABOVE-MENTIONED TYPE WHOSE PERSONNEL HAD BEEN INCLUDED UNDER GROUND FORCE MANPOWER, AND WHAT CATEGORY OF SERVICEMEN HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE FIGURES ON AIR FORCE MANPOWER?

37. TARASOV SAID QUESTION SEVEN WAS, EASTERN REPS WISHED TO ASK WESTERN REPS IN WHICH CATEGORY OF GROUND FORCES THE STRENGTH OF THE WEST BERLIN GARRISON OF WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS HAD BEEN INCLUDED?

38. TARASOV SAID THE EIGHTH QUESTION WAS, IN WHICH ARMED SERVICE HAD THE PERSONNEL OF SUPPORT UNITS OF NATO DIRECT
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00221 07 OF 11 151433Z

PARTICIPANT COUNTRIES PERFORMING FUNCTIONS IN THE INTERESTS OF TWO OR MORE ARMED SERVICES BEEN INCLUDED? IN WHICH CATEGORY OF MANPOWER HAD THESE PERSONNEL BE INCLUDED?

39. TARASOV SAID HIS NINTH QUESTION WAS, IN ANSWER TO AN EASTERN

QUESTION ON APRIL 3, US REP HAD USED THE TERM QUOTE NATO CORPS IN THE AREA UNQUOTE. EASTERN REPS WANTED TO KNOW WHETHER US REP HAD BY THIS MEANT CORPS OF MEMBER STATES OF NATO OR SOME UNIFIED MILITARY FORMATIONS OF THE NATO ORGANIZATION ITSELF?

40. TARASOV SAID HIS TENTH QUESTION WAS, IN ANSWERING THE EASTERN QUESTION WHETHER THERE WERE SOME DIVISIONS OR EQUIVALENT FORMATIONS IN THE GROUND FORCES OF THE WESTERN COUNTRIES WHOSE PERSONNEL HAD NOT BEEN INCLUDED BY THE WEST IN COUNTING THE STRENGTH OF MAJOR FORMATIONS, THE US REP HAD SAID ON MARCH 16, 1978 THAT THE PERSONNEL OF ALL DIVISIONS OF THE GROUND FORCES OF THE WESTERN COUNTRIES HAD BEEN INCLUDED UNDER MAJOR FORMATIONS IN DIVIDING THE OVERALL STRENGTH. SINCE THIS REPLY GIVEN BY THE US REP HAD REFERRED ONLY TO DIVISIONS AND THE EASTERN QUESTION HAD REFERRED BOTH TO DIVISIONS AND EQUIVALENT FORMATIONS, WAS IT CORRECT TO ASSUME THAT THERE WERE NO FORMATIONS WHATEVER IN THE GROUND FORCES OF THE WESTERN COUNTRIES WHICH WERE EQUIVALENT TO DIVISIONS? IF THERE, NEVERTHELESS, WERE SUCH FORMATIONS, EASTERN REPS WOULD LIKE TO KNOW, WHAT TYPES OF FORMATIONS WESTERN PARTICIPANTS CONSIDERED TO BE EQUIVALENT TO DIVISIONS, AND IN WHICH OF THE TWO CATEGORIES WESTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD INCLUDED THEM IN ALLOCATING FORCES?

41. TARASOV SAID THESE WERE ALL THE EASTERN QUESTIONS SO FAR.

42. US REP SAID HE WOULD ANSWER SOME OF THESE QUESTIONS AND RESERVE THE REST FOR THE NEXT SESSION.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00221 07 OF 11 151433Z

43. US REP SAID AS REGARDS TARASOV'S FIRST QUESTION, IT WAS CORRECT THAT THE WEST HAD INCLUDED IN ITS FIGUREES ONLY THE PERSONNEL OF FORMATIONS AND UNITS ASSIGNED TO ARMY CORPS. ALL OTHER FORMATIONS AND UNITS, REGARDLESS OF SIZE OR SUBORDINATION, EXCEPT FOR THOSE SUBORDINATED TO CORPS, HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY.

44. US REP SAID TARASOV'S SECOND QUESTION WAS ABOUT US MANPOWER. US REP BELIEVED THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION SHOULD ALREADY BE CLEAR FROM WHAT WESTERN REPS HAD SAID IN THE INFORMAL SESSION OF FEB 22, 1977, IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION POSED BY THE POLISH REP. WESTERN REPS HAD SAID THAT IN THE WESTERN DATA TABLED IN DEC 1976, THERE HAD BEEN NO INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF US PERSONNEL OVER THE FIGURES WHICH THE WEST HAD TABLED IN 1973. THE 14,000 MAN CHANGE IN THE TOTAL FOR WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WAS A RESULT OF A REVIEW AND REFINEMENT OF WESTERN COUNTING METHODOLOGY TO MAKE SURE THAT ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY MANPOWER HAD BEEN COUNTED. THE TWO SEPARATE GROUND FORCE FIGURES WHICH THE WEST HAD TABLED IN MARCH 1978 FOR US GROUND FORCE MANPOWER WHEN ADDED TOGETHER TOTALLED 192,500.

THERE WERE, OF COURSE, SOME ADDITIONAL US ARMY PERSONNEL IN
THE CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO MULTILATERAL HEADQUARTERS.

45. US REP SAID TARASOV HAD ASKED WESTERN REPS TO DESCRIBE
THE GENERAL TYPE OF HEADQUARTERS INCLUDED IN THE CATEGORY OF
MULTILATERAL HEADQUARTERS FOR GROUND AND AIR FORCES. THE ACTUAL
HEADQUARTERS WERE:

NATO INTERNATIONAL MILITARY STAFF
SHAPE
ALLIED FORCES, CENTRAL EUROPE
NORTHERN ARMY GROUP, CENTRAL EUROPE
CENTRAL ARMY GROUP, CENTRAL EUROPE
ALLIED LAND FORCES SCHLESWIG --
HOLSTEIN AND JUTLAND
ALLIED COMMAND EUROPE MOBILE FORCE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00221 07 OF 11 151433Z

ALLIED AIR FORCES, CENTRAL EUROPE
2ND ALLIED TACTICAL AIR FORCE
4TH ALLIED TACTICAL AIR FORCE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00221 08 OF 11 151440Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 ACDE-00 ISO-00 EUR-12 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05
SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00
INRE-00 /078 W

-----036225 151443Z /41

O R 151121Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2765
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS BELGIUM
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GERMANY

S E C R E T SECTION 8 OF 11 MBFR VIENNA 0221

46. US REP SAID TARASOV'S FIFTH QUESTION WAS, HAD THE PERSONNEL IN FORMATIONS AND UNITS NOT SUBORDINATED TO THE US COMMAND IN EUROPE BEEN COUNTED? THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION WAS YES, ALL SUCH PERSONNEL HAD BEEN COUNTED. US REP SAID HE ASSUMED THAT, BY DEFINITION, ALL WERE IN THE SECOND CATEGORY, BUT HE WISHED TO CHECK THIS FURTHER.

47. US REP SAID TARASOV'S SEVENTH QUESTION HAD BEEN ABOUT THE BERLIN GARRISONS OF THE WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THESE WERE IN THE SECOND CATEGORY.

48. US REP SAID THAT, IN TARASOV'S NINTH QUESTION, TARASOV HAD MENTIONED THAT US REP HAD SPOKEN OF QUOTE NATO CORPS UNQUOTE IN THE AREA. US REP HAD MEANT BY THIS TERM, THE CORPS OF NATO DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE AREA.

49. US REP SAID HE WISHED TO ASK A CLARIFYING QUESTION ABOUT ONE POINT IN TARASOV'S EARLIER REPLIES TO WESTERN
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00221 08 OF 11 151440Z

QUESTIONS. TARASOV HAD INDICATED THAT EASTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD INCLUDED UNITS OF BRIGADE SIZE IN THE CATEGORY OF MAJOR FORMATIONS. HAD EASTERN PARTICIPANTS INCLUDED ALL BRIGADES UNDER THIS CATEGORY?

50. AFTER CONSULTATION WITH KAPITANOV, TARASOV REPLIED THAT ALL BRIGADES SUBORDINATED TO THE HEADQUARTERS OF SOVIET FORCES IN THE GDR HAD BEEN INCLUDED UNDER MAJOR FORMATIONS.

51. FRG REP THEN PRESENTED THE WESTERN INITIATIVE.

52. DRAWING ON TALKING POINTS APPROVED BY THE AD HOC GROUP, FRG REP SAID THAT WESTERN REPS HAD POINTED OUT THAT THERE WAS INCREASING CONCERN IN THE WEST THAT NO SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS HAD BEEN MADE IN THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS ON FORCE REDUCTIONS. THE PARTICIPATING WESTERN GOVERNMENTS REMAINED FIRMLY CONVINCED OF THE NEED FOR STEPS WHICH WOULD ENHANCE STABILITY AND STRENGTHEN PEACE AND SECURITY IN EUROPE. WESTERN GOVERNMENTS WERE THEREFORE DETERMINED TO DO ALL IN THEIR POWER TO ACHIEVE A SATISFACTORY AGREEMENT ON THE MUTUAL REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS AND ASSOCIATED MEASURES IN CENTRAL EUROPE. FOR THESE REASONS, THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD DECIDED TO ADVANCE NEW PROPOSALS IN VIENNA WITH THE INTENTION OF MOVING THESE NEGOTIATIONS DECISIVELY TOWARDS A FIRST AGREEMENT.

53. FRG REP STATED THAT, IN THE COURSE OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS,

EASTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD REPEATEDLY EXPRESSED TWO PRINCIPAL INTERESTS: FIRST, THE EAST HAD ASKED FOR ASSURANCES IN PHASE I REGARDING THE AMOUNT AND TIMING OF PHASE II REDUCTIONS BY WESTERN EUROPEAN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND CANADA. SECOND, THE EAST HAD EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT THE WESTERN REQUIREMENT
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00221 08 OF 11 151440Z

FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF A SOVIET TANK ARMY. EASTERN REPS HAD CLAIMED THAT, BY DEMANDING THE WITHDRAWAL OF A COMPLETE TANK ARMY WITH ALL ITS ARMAMENTS, THE WEST HAD BEEN ASKING FOR WITHDRAWALS WHICH WOULD RESULT IN A GAP IN WARSAW TREATY DEFENSES AND IN THE LIMITATION OF THE WHOLE RANGE OF SOVIET GROUND FORCE ARMAMENTS. EASTERN REPS HAD EMPHASIZED THE OVERRIDING IMPORTANCE THEY ATTACHED TO THESE TWO CONCERNS.

54. FRG REP SAID THAT THE WESTERN PARTICIPATING GOVERNMENTS HAD NOW DECIDED ON A MAJOR NEW INITIATIVE, INTENDED AS A DECISIVE STEP TOWARD AGREEMENT ON MILITARILY SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS IN CENTRAL EUROPE LEADING TO ENHANCED STABILITY. THIS NEW INITIATIVE DEALT DIRECTLY WITH THESE TWO MAJOR INTERESTS WHICH EASTERN REPS HAD CONSIDERED SO IMPORTANT.

55. FRG REP THEN PRESENTED THE WESTERN PROPOSALS, HAVING ALSO PROVIDED EASTERN REPS WITH THE FULL TEXT.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00221 09 OF 11 151523Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05
SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00
INRE-00 /078 W

-----036518 151528Z /41

O R 151121Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2766
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS BELGIUM
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GERMANY

S E C R E T SECTION 9 OF 11 MBFR VIENNA 0221

BEGIN TEXT:

1. ALLIED NEGOTIATORS WISH TO PRESENT TO THE EAST THE FOLLOWING CHANGES IN THE EXISTING WESTERN PROPOSALS. THESE CHANGES ARE CONDITIONAL ON EAST/WEST AGREEMENT ON MANPOWER DATA. THOSE ASPECTS OF THE WESTERN PROGRAM WHICH ARE NOT DEALT WITH IN THIS INITIATIVE REMAIN AS THEY HAVE BEEN PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED.

2. THE WEST WOULD BE PREPARED TO AGREE TO THE FOLLOWING POINTS:

I. PHASE I COMMITMENTS REGARDING PHASE II REDUCTION

3. IN CONNECTION WITH A PHASE I AGREEMENT, THE TWO SIDES WOULD SPECIFY: FIRST, THE OVERALL TOTALS OF MANPOWER REDUCTIONS TO BE TAKEN IN PHASE II BY THE WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE US AND BY THE EASTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00221 09 OF 11 151523Z

THAN THE SOVIET UNION RESPECTIVELY, AS WELL AS THE AMOUNT OF THE MANPOWER REDUCTIONS TO BE TAKEN IN PHASE II BY THE US AND USSR, IN ORDER TO REACH THE AGREED COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING; AND SECOND, THE TIMING OF THESE PHASE II REDUCTIONS.

4. AS REGARDS THESE PHASE II REDUCTIONS, THE WEST WOULD BE PREPARED TO AGREE TO EITHER OF TWO ALTERNATIVES:

ALTERNATIVE ONE

IN CONNECTION WITH A PHASE I AGREEMENT, BOTH SIDES WOULD PROVIDE THAT THESE REDUCTIONS WOULD BE TAKEN IN PHASE II IN TWO REDUCTION STAGES:

(1) IN THE FIRST OF THESE TWO STAGES, EACH SIDE WOULD MAKE REDUCTIONS CALCULATED BY TAKING AN AGREED EQUAL PERCENTAGE OF 40 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF REDUCTIONS STILL NEEDED BY THAT SIDE TO REACH THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING AFTER THE AGREED PHASE I REDUCTIONS BY THE US AND USSR HAVE BEEN DEDUCTED. THESE REDUCTIONS WOULD BE TAKEN COLLECTIVELY BY ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS ON EACH SIDE OTHER THAN THE US AND USSR. THESE FIRST STAGE REDUCTIONS WOULD TAKE PLACE WITHIN A FIXED PERIOD OF TIME, SAY TWO YEARS, AFTER ENTRY INTO FORCE OF A PHASE I AGREEMENT.

(2) IN THE SECOND OF THESE TWO STAGES, EACH SIDE WOULD ALSO REDUCE BY AN EQUAL PERCENTAGE OF 60 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED TO COMPLETE MOVEMENT TO THE COMMON CEILING AFTER THE AGREED PHASE I REDUCTIONS HAVE BEEN DEDUCTED. THE NUMBER OF REDUCTIONS WHICH WOULD BE TAKEN BY THE US AND USSR IN THIS STAGE AND THE OVERALL TOTALS OF REDUCTIONS TO BE TAKEN IN THIS STAGE BY THE WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE US AND BY THE EASTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00221 09 OF 11 151523Z

THE USSR RESPECTIVELY WOULD BE SPECIFIED IN PHASE I. THESE SECOND STAGE REDUCTIONS WOULD TAKE PLACE WITHIN A FIXED PERIOD OF TIME AFTER ENTRY INTO FORCE OF A PHASE I AGREEMENT, E.G. THREE YEARS.

(3) SECOND PHASE NEGOTIATIONS WOULD DETERMINE THE MODALITIES OF THE PHASE II REDUCTIONS ESTABLISHED IN PHASE I AND DEAL WITH OTHER TOPICS WHICH MAY BE RAISED BY THE PARTICIPANTS.

ALTERNATIVE TWO

(1) IN CONNECTION WITH A PHASE I AGREEMENT, THE OVERALL TOTALS OF REDUCTIONS TO BE TAKEN IN PHASE II BY ALL WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE US AND BY ALL EASTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE USSR RESPECTIVELY, AS WELL AS THE NUMBER OF REDUCTIONS TO BE TAKEN IN PHASE II BY THE US AND THE USSR, TO REACH THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING, WOULD BE SPECIFIED. THIS WOULD TAKE PLACE IN ADDITION TO PROVIDING FOR AGREED US AND SOVIET REDUCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS IN PHASE I AS THE WEST HAS PROPOSED.

(2) THE PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS WOULD DETERMINE THE MODALITIES OF PHASE II REDUCTIONS ESTABLISHED IN PHASE I AND DEAL WITH OTHER TOPICS WHICH MAY BE RAISED BY THE PARTICIPANTS. A COMMITMENT IN CONNECTION WITH A PHASE I AGREEMENT WOULD ALSO PROVIDE THAT THE PHASE II REDUCTIONS WOULD TAKE PLACE WITHIN A FIXED PERIOD OF TIME, SAY THREE YEARS, FROM THE ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE PHASE I AGREEMENT.

5. IN BOTH ALTERNATIVES, PHASE I WOULD ALSO PROVIDE THAT, IF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS DID NOT RESULT IN TIMELY AGREEMENT, EACH SIDE WOULD NEVERTHELESS IMPLEMENT THOSE PHASE II REDUCTIONS SPECIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH A PHASE I AGREEMENT.

II. PHASE I WITHDRAWALS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00221 09 OF 11 151523Z

6. AS REGARDS SOVIET WITHDRAWALS IN PHASE I:

(1) THE WEST HAS PROPOSED THAT IN PHASE I, THE SOVIET UNION SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS TO THE USSR A TANK ARMY CONSISTING OF 5 DIVISIONS INCLUDING 68,000 MEN AND 1,700 MAIN BATTLE TANKS.

(2) THE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS ARE WILLING TO CHANGE THEIR ORIGINAL PROPOSAL FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF A COMPLETE SOVIET TANK ARMY WITH 68,000 MEN, 1,700 TANKS AND ALL OTHER EQUIPMENT TO THE EXTENT THAT:

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00221 10 OF 11 151524Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05
SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00
INRE-00 /078 W

-----036533 151534Z /41

O R 151121Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2767
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 10 OF 11 MBFR VIENNA 0221

(A) THE SOVIET UNION WOULD BE EXPECTED TO WITHDRAW FROM THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS TO THE USSR NOT A COMPLETE TANK ARMY, BUT 68,000 SOLDIERS, 5 DIVISIONS, AND 1,700 TANKS.

(B) THE WEST WOULD NOT INSIST ON THE WITHDRAWAL BY THE SOVIET UNION OF ARMAMENTS OTHER THAN MAIN BATTLE TANKS.

(C) RESIDUAL HOLDINGS OF SOVIET COMBAT EQUIPMENT OTHER THAN TANKS WOULD NOT BE PLACED UNDER ANY LIMITATIONS.

(D) LIMITATIONS WOULD, HOWEVER, BE IMPOSED ON THE OVERALL RESIDUAL TOTAL OF SOVIET GROUND MANPOWER, ON THE COMBINED TOTAL OF SOVIET AIR AND GROUND MANPOWER, AND ON SOVIET MAIN BATTLE TANKS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS.

7. THE WEST WOULD BE PREPARED TO AGREE THAT THE PHASE I AGREEMENT WOULD SPECIFY THAT THERE WILL BE NO LIMITATION ON THE OVERALL NUMBER OF US AND SOVIET UNITS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS OR ON
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00221 10 OF 11 151524Z

THE LOCATION OF SUCH UNITS INSIDE THAT AREA.

8. AS REGARDS PHASE I US WITHDRAWALS, THE US WOULD BE PREPARED TO AGREE THAT APPROXIMATELY TWO-THIRDS OF ITS PHASE I MANPOWER REDUCTIONS WOULD RESULT IN THE WITHDRAWAL OF UNITS OR SUBUNITS.

9. THE US AND USSR, PRIOR TO SIGNING A PHASE I AGREEMENT, WOULD EXCHANGE LISTS, WHICH WOULD CONTAIN THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION ON THE MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS TO BE WITHDRAWN IN PHASE I:

- (1) COMPLETE MILITARY IDENTIFICATION
- (2) GARRISON LOCATION
- (3) PERSONNEL STRENGTH (THE NUMBER OF PERSONNEL THAT WILL BE REDUCED WHEN THE ORGANIZATION IS WITHDRAWN).

III. ASSOCIATED MEASURES

10. THE WESTERN PARTICIPATING GOVERNMENTS CONTINUE TO ATTACH GREAT WEIGHT TO ASSOCIATED MEASURES, THAT IS, STABILIZING, VERIFICATION AND NON-CIRCUMVENTION MEASURES, APPLICABLE IN BOTH REDUCTION PHASES FOR INCREASING MILITARY STABILITY IN EUROPE. THESE MEASURES WOULD, IN OUR VIEW, HELP REDUCE THE RISKS OF MILITARY CONFRONTATION AND INCREASE CONFIDENCE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST. THE WEST WILL THEREFORE ADDRESS THIS SUBJECT IN THE COURSE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS AS A MATTER TO BE AGREED IN PHASE I.

IV. CLOSING REMARKS

11. IN CONCLUSION, THE WEST IS PREPARED TO AGREE TO THE FOREGOING POINTS IF THE EAST IS PREPARED TO AGREE IN PHASE I TO THE SOVIET AND US REDUCTIONS SPECIFIED ABOVE AND TO A COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING ON GROUND FORCE MANPOWER AT ABOUT 700,000 MEN AND ON GROUND AND AIR FORCE MANPOWER AT ABOUT 900,000 MEN
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00221 10 OF 11 151524Z

WHICH WOULD BE REACHED BY FURTHER REDUCTIONS IN PHASE II. THESE PROPOSALS ARE ALSO MADE ON THE CONDITION THAT AGREEMENT IS REACHED ON MANPOWER DATA, AND THAT COMMITMENTS TO BE UNDERTAKEN IN PHASE I REGARDING THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS ARE RESTRICTED TO THOSE PROPOSED BY THE WEST, NAMELY ON SOVIET MAIN BATTLE TANKS AND THE SPECIFIED US NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS.
END TEXT:

56. FRG REP SAID THAT HE WISHED TO MAKE A SHORT COMMENT ON THESE PROPOSALS. THIS NEW WESTERN INITIATIVE DIRECTLY ADDRESSED TWO MAJOR EASTERN CONCERNS. FIRST, THE INITIATIVE WOULD SPECIFY IN PHASE I A COMMITMENT ON THE OVERALL AMOUNT AND TIMING OF MANPOWER REDUCTIONS TO BE TAKEN IN PHASE II BY THE WESTERN EUROPEAN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND CANADA. SECOND, THIS INITIATIVE WOULD CHANGE THE REDUCTIONS ENVISAGED FOR PHASE I. IT WOULD REDUCE REQUIREMENTS ON THE USSR, WHICH WOULD NOW BE EXPECTED TO WITHDRAW 68,000 SOLDIERS, FIVE DIVISIONS, AND 1,700 MAIN BATTLE TANKS. THIS TANK REDUCTION SHOULD INCLUDE ALL THE MAIN BATTLE TANKS IN THE FIVE DIVISIONS.

57. FRG REP STATED THAT, FOR ITS PART, THE US WOULD BE PREPARED TO AGREE THAT APPROXIMATELY TWO-THIRDS OF US PHASE I MANPOWER REDUCTIONS WOULD RESULT IN THE WITHDRAWAL OF UNITS OR SUBUNITS. EASTERN REPS WOULD ALSO NOTE THAT THE WEST WAS ASKING FOR RESIDUAL LIMITATIONS ON SOVIET MANPOWER AND ON MAIN BATTLE TANKS, AND NOT ON ALL THE ARMAMENTS OF A SOVIET TANK ARMY. THIS PROPOSAL WAS MADE ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE WEST WOULD, THROUGH EFFECTIVE ASSOCIATED MEASURES, RECEIVE THE ASSURANCE IT HAD ALWAYS SOUGHT THAT LIMITATIONS WOULD BE RESPECTED.

58. FRG REP SAID THAT HE WISHED TO REITERATE THAT THESE PROPOSALS WERE CONDITIONAL ON EAST/WEST AGREEMENT ON MILITARY MANPOWER DATA, WHICH WAS THE MAJOR OPEN ISSUE OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS. WESTERN PARTICIPANTS CONSIDERED THAT THE PRESENT WESTERN PROPOSALS DEALT IN A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE WAY WITH

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00221 11 OF 11 151524Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05
SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00
INRE-00 /078 W

-----036544 151534Z /50

O R 151121Z APR 78

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2768
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 11 OF 11 MBFR VIENNA 0221

OTHER MAJOR OPEN ISSUES OF A FIRST AGREEMENT, THAT IS, WITH PHASE I REDUCTION COMMITMENTS REGARDING PHASE II REDUCTIONS AND WITH PHASE I REDUCTIONS AS SUCH, INCLUDING THE ISSUE OF ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS. ASSUMING THAT AGREEMENT ON DATA WAS ULTIMATELY ACHIEVED, THESE WESTERN PROPOSALS SHOULD THEREFORE PROVIDE A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE BASIS FOR REACHING A FIRST AGREEMENT IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS. CONSEQUENTLY, WESTERN REPS CONSIDERED THAT, IF THE EAST SERIOUSLY DESIRED TO MOVE AHEAD TO AN AGREEMENT, IT SHOULD ACCEPT THE WESTERN APPROACH AS REVISED BY THESE PROPOSALS.

59. FRG REP SAID THE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS WERE, OF COURSE, READY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS WHICH EASTERN REPS MIGHT HAVE ON THESE PROPOSALS EITHER IN THE PRESENT SESSION OR IN THE NEXT SESSION.

60. TARASOV SAID THAT IT WENT WITHOUT SAYING THAT EASTERN REPS WOULD THOROUGHLY STUDY THESE PROPOSALS AND WOULD REPORT THEM TO THEIR GOVERNMENTS. IT WAS MOST LIKELY THAT EASTERN REPS WOULD
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00221 11 OF 11 151524Z

HAVE SOME QUESTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH CLARIFYING SOME POINTS OF THE WESTERN PROPOSALS SUBMITTED IN THE PRESENT SESSION. EASTERN REPS ALSO HOPED THAT THEY WOULD HAVE TIME AND OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS THESE PROPOSALS IN THE COURSE OF THE SUBSEQUENT NEGOTIATIONS. THEREFORE, EASTERN REPS WOULD AT PRESENT HAVE NO COMMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THESE PROPOSALS.

61. THE SESSION WAS CONCLUDED. IT WAS AGREED TO HOLD THE NEXT SESSION ON APRIL 14. THE WEST WILL BE HOST. RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: DISARMAMENT, MEETING REPORTS, NEGOTIATIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 15 apr 1978
Decaption Date: 01 jan 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978MBFRV00221
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780162-0727
Format: TEL
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780452/aaaabsiu.tel
Line Count: 1294
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 041428ad-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 24
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 13 may 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2956284
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF APRIL 12, 1978
TAGS: PARM, XH, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/041428ad-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014